

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This action is under final. The amendments to the claims follow the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter, and therefore applicant anticipates acceptance of the amendments, and allowance.

Prior to this amendment, claims 1, 3-7, 10, 15, 17-21, 23, 24 and 26-33 were pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 6, 7, 15, 17-21, 23, 24, 27, and 30-33 are canceled; accordingly claims 1, 3-5, 10, 26, 28, and 29 are now presented for examination and allowance.

No new matter has been added; support for the amendments to the claims is found throughout the application.

Claim objection

The Examiner objected to claim 30 because applicant inadvertently misnumbered it as "28". This claim (which has been canceled in this amendment) now shows the proper numbering; i.e., it is now numbered claim 30.

Allowable subject Matter – "Objected to" claim

The Examiner indicated that claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 7 and its intervening claim 6, thereby providing the same effect as rewriting claim 7. Accordingly, applicant has canceled claims 6 and 7, and presents claim 1. Applicant has amended dependent claim 26 (previously dependent upon claim 24) to now be dependent upon claim 1.

Therefore applicant requests allowance of all pending claims.

Rejections under §103

Claims 15, 17-21, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison et al. in view of Gronemeyer. In light of the amendments to the claims to include the allowable subject matter of claim 7, this rejection has been rendered moot, and applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under §103.

Reply to Examiner's response

In the Office Action of Response to Arguments, the Examiner stated that applicant does not amend claims 15 and 24 as recited in the Remarks. Although these claims have been

canceled and this point is now moot, applicant would like to reply. Applicant had stated: "The amendments to the claims clarify that the time difference is transmitted to the mobile station, and also clarify use of the time difference to reduce code phase search space in the mobile station." Since claim 15 claims the reference receiver that transmits the time difference, but does not claim the mobile station, and claim 24 also claims the reference receiver, it would have been more precise to say "and/or" instead of "and" in the previous statement. Applicant apologizes for any confusion that may have resulted.

CONCLUSION

The applicant has addressed all of the Examiner's rejections and/or objections as expressed in the outstanding office action, and accordingly applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate the same with the undersigned.

In the event that additional fees are required or credit is due or an extension is required, authorization is hereby given to charge Deposit Acct. No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,
QUALCOMM Incorporated

Dated: October 25, 2007

By: /James D. McFarland/

James D. McFarland, Reg. No. 32,544
Attorney for Applicant
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, CA 92121-1714
Phone: 858-651-8840